UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,768	01/02/2001	Scott D. Redmond	PA4181US	2019
22830 CARR & FERR	7590 04/01/200 RELL LLP	EXAMINER		
2200 GENG RO		SHELEHEDA, JAMES R		
PALO ALTO, (_A 94505		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/753,768	REDMOND, SCOTT D.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAMES SHELEHEDA	2623		

	JAMES SHELEHEDA	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ft)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a content of the content of the	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 	The 112, first paragraph rejection,	of claim 26.	,
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-45.		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea rand was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Chris Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments on page 7, regarding the rejection of claim 20, has been considered but is not persuasive. The various portions of the specification cited by applicant (without any indication of their location and context within the specification) fail to support the recited claim limitations. While the device may connect to a video service through a subscribed wireless information service and additionally may form a "mini local area network", there is no support for receiving video/audio over the "mini local area network."

On page 9, applicant argues that the use of a "secondary channel for data exchange" there must be a primary channel. In response, it is noted that the rejection is not directed to the existence of any sort of "primary channel". The specification discloses utilizing a secondary channel for the wireless communications session (page 5, lines 1-13). Thus, the secondary channel is utilized to request and receive the desired video (page 5, lines 1-21). Thus, there is no support for data on the sideband to "accompany" the video/audio, as the video/audio is received via the sideband. There is no disclosure of utilizing the "primary" channel whatsoever, and further, no disclosure of receiving any video or audio via that channel.

Applicant's arguments on pages 10-11, have been considered but is not persuasive. The various portions of the specification cited by applicant (without any indication of their location and context within the specification) fail to support the recited claim limitations. While the device may connect to a video service through a subscribed wireless information service and additionally may form a "mini local area network", there is no support for receiving video/audio over the "mini local area network." It is noted that while the specification describes wherein a billboard "could operate as a cellular telephone array or similar wireless carrier" this is specifically disclosed as an alternative to connecting to the billboard for communicating in a local network (page 10, lines 1-11). In this context, the billboard is not acting as a "proxy" as applicant suggests, but would simply comprise the tower (13) shown in Fig. 1.

In regards to applicant's arguments on page 12, it is noted that applicant's citation of the specification has been taken out of context and provides no support for exchanging audio/video content via a serial cable. The indicated portion of the specification explicitly indicates that docking pins allow information to be retrieved from RAM, 63. There is absolutely no disclosure of the USB serial cable being used to exchange video/audio data.

Further, it is noted that the claim language recites "exchanging audio/video content" which would require a two-way transaction or "trade". The specification provides no support for a two-way transmission of video via the docking port.

In regards to applicant's arguments on page 12, it is noted that the indicated portion of the specification explicitly indicates that docking pins allow "information" to be retrieved and modified from RAM, 63. There is no specific disclosure of retrieving video data from RAM, as the RAM also includes program code and data values (page 8, lines 1-4).

Further, it is noted that the claim language recites "exchanging audio/video content" which would require a two-way transaction or "trade". The specification provides no support for a two-way transmission of video via the docking port.

Applicant's arguments on pages 12-13, have been considered but is not persuasive. The various portions of the specification cited by applicant (without any indication of their location and context within the specification) fail to support the recited claim limitations. While the device may receive a video service through a communications session, none of the indicated portions disclose wherein the device will transmit the recorded video.

On pages 13-14, regarding Tran and Whiteside, applicant argues that the billboard will continuously broadcast, and thus would not include or require a proximity sensor.

In response, it is noted that in Whiteside, it is the cellular telephone, and NOT the billboard, which was relied upon. Thus, when within range of the billboard, the cell phone detects the signals transmitted from the billboard and then initiates communications.